

**Remarks**

Claims 1-7, 9, and 11-21 are pending in the present application. 1, 3, 5, and 21 have been amended. Claims 9, 11-17 and 20 have been cancelled.

**Drawings:**

The Examiner has not accepted the replacement sheet received on February 20, 2009. The Examiner indicates that the replacement sheet contains new matter.

The Examiner has also objected to the drawings under 37 CFR §1.83(a) for failing to show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. More specifically, the Examiner states that “the control unit, and support device must be shown or the feature(s) canceled from the claim(s).” The Applicants have cancelled claims 9, 11-17 and 20 which recite these features. Therefore, the objection is believed to be overcome.

**Claim Rejections – 35 USC §112:**

The Examiner has rejected claims 11-21 under 35 USC §112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. More specifically, the Examiner states that “[t]he recitations in claims 11 and 20 of features of a support device and a control element in relation to the struts are not enabled by the original disclosure.”

As stated above, the Applicants have cancelled 11-17 and 20 to overcome this rejection and the rejection should be withdrawn. Additionally, claim 9 has been cancelled as claim 9 also recited the features of the support device and the control element.

The Applicants believe that the rejection of claims 18, 19, and 21 was in error. Claims 18, 19 and 21 remain in the application because they do not claim the support device or the control element and are dependent from allowable claim 1. Accordingly, the Applicants request that the rejection of allowable claims 18, 19 and 21 be withdrawn.

Claims 1-7, 9 and 11-21 are rejected under 35 USC §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which the

applicant regards as the invention. More specifically, the Examiner states that “the recitation of ‘at least two’ struts is not commensurate in scope with the disclosure which only supports a pair of struts.”

The Applicants have amended claims 1, 3, 5, and 21 to remove the recitation of “at least”. Therefore, this rejection is believed overcome and should be withdrawn.

**Allowable Subject Matter:**

The Examiner has indicated that claims 1-7 and 9 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejections under 35 USC §112, second paragraph, set forth in this Office Action.

As discussed above, the Applicants have removed the recitation of “at least” and cancelled claim 9. Therefore, the Applicants believe that claims 1-7 are in condition for allowance.


As also discussed above, claims 18, 19, and 21 depend from allowable claim 1 and are also allowable for at least the same reason that claim 1 is allowable. Therefore, the Applicants believe that claims 18, 19, and 21 are also in condition for allowance.

CONCLUSIONS

This Amendment is believed to be fully responsive to the Office Action mailed April 13, 2009. The amendments to the claims, the remarks in support of the amended and rejected claims, and the new claims are believed to place this application in condition for allowance, which action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

**Helmut Von Stock-Hausen-Petersen, et al.**

By 

Lisa M. Muhleck

Reg. No. 61,710

Date: 6/24/09

QUINN LAW GROUP, PLLC  
39555 Orchard Hill Place, Ste. 520  
Novi, Michigan 48375  
Phone: 248-380-9300  
Fax: 248-380-8968